

External Evaluation of the Peace Mediation Programme of The Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs

Final Report

5 SEPTEMBER 2011

**THIS REPORT CONTAINS SENSITIVE AND CONFIDENTIAL
INFORMATION. IT INTENDED AS AN INTERNAL WORKING
DOCUMENT OF THE SWISS FDFA.**



Evaluation Team:

Brian Ganson

Nicklas Svensson

Senior Advisor:

Laurie Nathan

PEACE MEDIATION PROGRAMME OF THE SWISS FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

EXTERNAL EVALUATION

Table of Contents

Summary Findings & Recommendations.....	1
Goals and Aspirations.....	6
Institutional Context.....	6
Strategic Intent	7
Theories of Change	8
Results	9
Indicia of Success.....	9
Reference Cases	10
Support of the UN MSU	10
Engagement in Western Papua.....	12
CBM on the Korean Peninsula.....	14
Specific Findings	16
Internal Metrics	16
External Metrics	17
MSP Metrics.....	20
In the Aggregate	21
Recommendations	22
Implications for MD	23
Implications for MSP	28
Implications for the MD / MSP Relationship.....	29
In Conclusion	30
Annexes	32
Placeholder for Summary of Mediation Activities PA IV (2000-2011)	33
Completed MSP Outputs (2005-2010)	39
Constructed Logical Framework Analysis	49
List of Persons Consulted.....	50
Evaluator Biographies	51

The purpose of this evaluation is to learn from the past five years of mediation activities of the Mediation Desk (MD) and its main partner, the Mediation Support Project (MSP), in order to shape the future strategic orientation of the MD and the MSP. As a secondary goal, this evaluation will provide accountability with respect to past achievements and results. While necessarily placing their activities within the broader Swiss government, FDFA and PD IV context, the evaluation focuses mainly on the activities of the Mediation Desk, including the activities of MSP and the cooperation between MD and MSP.

SUMMARY FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The MD, established in 2005, is emerging from a pilot phase of intense activity, experimentation, reflection, learning and adjustment. The review found increased success over the course of the MD's development, such as in West Papua, where the evaluation found a more coherent, multi-faceted, long-term approach that may help build towards political negotiations in that conflict. Given the newness of the very idea of structured mediation support in the international mediation community in 2005, as well as the ambitious goal the FDFA has set for itself – a notable increase in Swiss contributions to mediations that transform international conflicts – it should not be surprising that the evaluation also encountered some difficult lessons learned. In the aggregate, the evaluation finds “proof of concept” for the value of specialized mediation support within FDFA. It finds the MD well-positioned, in collaboration with its FDFA partners, to better define both its role and the focus of its activities to increase the relevance and impact of Swiss efforts going forward.

The evaluation finds that the MD has increased the visibility and stature of Swiss mediation and mediation support among international actors. The United Nation's Mediation Support Unit considers the Swiss FDFA an “essential partner” in light of both its funding and its intellectual support. A prominent international peacebuilding organization has noted that the Swiss FDFA is one of the few international funders of mediation projects that can also be considered a thought partner in understanding conflicts and designing interventions. At the same time, the MD has helped to normalize the idea and practice of mediation within the FDFA.

The MD has also created a substantial reserve of mediation and mediation support expertise within the FDFA. Its methodological advances – for example, in the debriefing and capture of mediator experience – are well respected. The research it has supported – including, for example, on the economic dimensions of peace processes – has demonstrably advanced thinking on critical yet neglected topics of international

mediation. Such research-based advances inform training programmes that are widely appreciated, giving credence to the claim of a synergistic set of activities.

The evaluation found, however, significant barriers to translating these strengths into clear progress towards one of Switzerland's fundamental goals in the areas of mediation and mediation support: to substantially expand and improve the impact of direct Swiss contributions to on-going peace processes. The reasons for this are various and complex, and will not be resolved with a focus solely on changes the MD can unilaterally implement. A systems perspective at the level of the FDFA will be required.

The evaluation found that the many FDFA actors involved in on-going facilitation and mediation efforts had limited commitment to the systematic application of mediation best practices and lessons from Swiss experience. Some respondents attribute this to the limited time and resources of busy officials. Others suggested limited appreciation for the emerging consensus on international mediation: that it is not the role of a heroic individual, but rather a team effort that requires analysis of the conflict and prior attempts at peacemaking; careful evaluation of strategic and tactical options; expert design, management and evaluation of the intervention; and consistent outreach to the parties, stakeholders, and other third party intervenors. It does not appear to be a reflex across FDFA to ask what best practice may be, what more structured support or systematic engagement might look like, or how past Swiss experience could help.

The evaluation also found relatively weak linkages among MD and those across the FDFA most likely to recognize the possibility for, create entry points for, or initiate Swiss-led mediation and facilitation processes. There is on the one hand a recognition that mediation and facilitation are implemented across the FDFA: by thematic desks, geographic desks, special envoys, and others "at the middle and upper levels of the hierarchy" who often bring substantial insight and experience to the table. There is on the other hand the challenge that – as evidenced by the Turkey-Armenia mediation and other examples – the more prominent or urgent the mediation process, the less likely it seems that the expert assistance of the Mediation Desk will be integrated into an on-going intervention to improve its analysis, planning, or coherence. While the broader FDFA must be engaged if entry points for Swiss assistance are to be cultivated, there are limited entry points for the MD within the broader organization.

Finally, the evaluation found relatively few follow-on effects from the international deployment of individual Swiss mediators. The personal accomplishments of particular Swiss diplomats and experts are widely recognized and greatly appreciated. But the

commitment, skill, and impact are largely attributed to the individual, rather than to the institution. Such deployments therefore do not tend to create opportunities for other Swiss agents to raise their profile, skill or experience, or for broader Swiss-led mediation and mediation support activities to emerge.

The cumulative result is that the MD acts in a system where it for the most part represents a reserve of expertise responding to varied and sundry requests for assistance, rather than as a catalyst of strategy and planning for Swiss-led mediation and mediation support activities. Its programmatic interventions have been largely scattered and episodic, rendering them less likely to be sustainable or well-linked to other actors. As they were often not the product of an in-depth conflict or process analysis or a strategic and clearly-articulated theory of change, MD activities have not necessarily been focused on key conflict dynamics and were unlikely to be “big enough or long enough” to measure up to OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) peacebuilding evaluation standards of relevance, effectiveness, or impact at the levels to which Switzerland evidently aspires.

These broader systems issues also impact the evaluation of the MSP. The evaluation found strong support for the proposition that the MSP efficiently produces quality work products. Its research products are generally perceived to be of very high quality; it is in general appreciated when Swiss expertise come into a dialogue or mediation process to run workshops on processes and substance. Products are typically well-designed and adapted to audiences. MSP staff are well-regarded, generally perceived as easy to work with, dependably focused on how they can be helpful, and capable of independently delivering high-quality work that combines research and practice perspectives. But feedback is more mixed on the MSP’s ultimate impact. It is unclear to many whom the intended audience for knowledge management and research products may be, or how the transition from bookshelf to changes in real-world practice – particularly within the FDFA itself – are intended to be made. Many doubt that the FDFA’s institutional memory, quality assurance and continuity have improved as intended through the MSP’s work.

The evaluation finds that a move from a latent to a more manifest mediation and mediation support capability will first of all require disciplined application of peacebuilding best practices. The FDFA has been an active partner in the development of the OECD DAC guidance, with its emphasis on in-depth conflict analysis, clear and cogent theories of change, and well-defined indicators. The June 2007 Federal Council Message to Parliament notes from Swiss experience the importance of, *inter alia*, long

term commitments, harmonized high-level and civil society initiatives, close cooperation among expert mediators and qualified experts, attention to best practice, and team approaches. Swiss actors clearly have the intellectual foundation to know what is required. Progress will to some extent turn on the commitment of actors across FDFA taking its own best advice on systematic and structured engagement.

Clearly indicated is PD IV and FDFA leadership support for better integration of the expert resources of the Mediation Desk with the priorities and perspectives of FDFA colleagues and their work. A starting point may be joint analysis of conflicts, which would contribute a mediation and facilitation perspective to SDC, PD IV, and other PD thematic and geographic analysis. For conflicts of particular interest to Switzerland, an on-going “peace process desk” function might be indicated, even before the initiation of any particular Swiss intervention. In promising cases, this could lead to joint exploration of challenges and opportunities for Swiss intervention, with proposals submitted for consideration and decision-making at appropriate levels of the FDFA. With concrete priorities in mind, partners across FDFA can better assess the extent to which programmatic support from the MD would be additive and constructive. All of this must be supported by an enhanced internal engagement strategy by the MD.

The evaluation recommends that the ultimate goal should be an FDFA mediation strategy, rather than separate priorities and initiatives across the organization. At least for a select number of high-priority opportunities for Swiss mediation or mediation support, the evaluation finds that there would be substantial benefit to the MD working to build a “virtuous circle” of FDFA intervention. This would involve harmonizing internal and external analysis, research, capacity-building, networking, financial support, technical support, and mediation and facilitation efforts to build greater concentration and coherence of Swiss action. Of course, this also requires the engaged cooperation of FDFA leadership and colleagues; the MD by itself cannot address systems-wide challenges or responses to them.

Should these recommendations be followed, the most evident implication for the MD itself is the need for at least modest additional resources. One can predict that expert staff with strong consultative skills and adequate time to invest are required if they are to be welcomed by FDFA colleagues as partners in their work. Some investment in enhanced organizational capabilities may also be required, for example, to develop frameworks for peace process analysis or approaches to opportunity identification and vetting particularly suited to the FDFA. It is unrealistic to think that the MD can fulfil its internal and external mandates with only one full-time professional.

The most important implication for the MSP may be the need to acknowledge that its constituent partners perform a variety of roles on behalf of the FDFA. Where the MSP is acting as an extension of the MD's key responsibilities – for example, debriefing Swiss mediators to build FDFA's knowledge base, facilitating joint analysis across FDFA partners, or conducting the flagship peace mediation course – even tighter integration into FDFA systems and processes may be indicated. Here it is the "MSP" which is acting. Where, however, the goal is targeted support for FDFA outreach or activities, it may be best not to presume that standing resources are the right ones at the right time to meet a particular need. Here it is a talented organization acting, but one that must be considered alongside other talented organizations for the best possible fit to need. The MD must ensure that activities are driven by FDFA priorities, backed up by institutional commitment, rather than by supply-driven programming.

The pragmatic implications of these findings can be summarized as follows:

1. The development of a logical framework analysis should be considered the highest priority. This should be based on state-of-the-field and future-of-the-field analysis, and result in relevant, clear and measureable objectives; explicit theories of change and programme logic; complete and ongoing conflict analysis; development and monitoring of relevant indicators; a focus on strategy and policy coherence; and the practice of systematic, rigorous evaluation of programme impact.
2. Joint examinations among the MD and PD IV and other FDFA colleagues of conflicts and third party interventions can provide the basis for collaborative learning and joint planning, providing a foundation for greater alignment and political commitment across FDFA for Swiss intervention in current or potential peace processes. It will help the MD transition towards a smaller portfolio of interventions for which there is stronger organizational commitment.
3. Increasing commitment and skill across FDFA requires that more people see the relevance of mediation and mediation support to their own work. This can be achieved, for example, through focus in training on mediation support roles; internal networking of learning and reflection for Swiss actors who touch on peace processes, facilitation or mediation around themes of immediate relevance to their work; or leveraging of the work of high-level Swiss facilitators and mediators to create opportunities for other Swiss agents to raise their profile, skill or experience.

4. The Swiss point of view on mediation support as a thematic area needs to be better defined. Based on that understanding, activities can be prioritized – among current and potential research and publication support, the flagship PMC, funding of international partners, international advocacy, etc. – that are most useful and important to promoting the Swiss perspective.
5. A natural role for the MSP may be to support MD analytic engagement with FDFA and other partners: enabling efficient, useful joint learning and analysis across FDFA; developing tools or frameworks that inform evaluation of opportunities for Swiss intervention and balancing of risks and benefits from a Swiss perspective; supporting networking or joint learning among the variety of Swiss actors engaged in facilitation or mediation activities; or playing a “peace process desk” or “mediation support” function on an on-going basis for a particular conflict.

These summary findings and recommendations are explored in greater depth in the balance of the evaluation report that follows.

GOALS AND ASPIRATIONS

Activities of both MD and MSP since 2005 have grown largely “organically,” without a specific articulation of strategy, theories of change, or target outcomes. For evaluation purposes, the strategic intent behind the MSP and MD has been reconstructed from documents and interviews, and the mechanisms and theories of change implicit in its work “backwards engineered” from its activities and reflections by its staff. While such an approach can neither perfectly capture the thinking across the period 2005-2010, nor include all stakeholder points of view, it provides a consensus view of the strategic intent underlying the Mediation Desk and the organizational approaches to realizing that intent as broadly acknowledged.

Institutional Context

The Federal Constitution dated 18 April 1999 explicitly cites efforts to promote the peaceful cohabitation of peoples as a foreign policy objective for Switzerland. Based on the successful mediation experiences of the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs in the 1990s, the Swiss Parliament defined mediation and good offices as important tools for the promotion of peace. It gave the Swiss FDFA the task to strengthen its competencies in this regard.

Among its actions was the establishment of a Mediation Desk within PD IV. Its overall goal is to assess, identify, coordinate and implement FDFA's mediation activities in selected violent conflicts on a so-called "track 1 level," and in supporting other partners and mediation organizations through Swiss expertise and finances.

PD IV in turn initiated in 2005 the Mediation Support Project (MSP). The four main working areas of MSP are: knowledge management and research; training; networking; and direct support of on-going mediation processes.

Strategic Intent

From its inception, it was widely hoped that the MD would catalyse and support a notable increase in Swiss contributions to mediation that transforms international conflicts. It was understood that this would require concurrent progress on a number of fronts:

- Influence of Swiss and international policy-making in ways that support international mediation and Switzerland's role within it.
- Increase of Swiss capabilities to conduct and support mediation. Swiss actors should demonstrate state-of-the-art capabilities in mediation and mediation support, and an increased number of Swiss actors should be capable to mediate and support mediation.
- Creation of entry points for Swiss assistance by building Swiss reputation and visibility. Externally, Switzerland should be increasingly perceived as, and called on, as a mediation resource. Internal to the FDFA, Swiss agents should increasingly identify mediation with Swiss values and interests.
- Contribution to a positive view of Swiss diplomacy, remaining congruent with Swiss values, identity, reputation and potential unique contributions.

Two observations can be made even at this early juncture. First, a primary intent was to successfully and productively deploy more Swiss in mediation and mediation support roles in international conflicts. Second, this strategic intent was notably ambitious.

Theories Of Change[†]

The Federal Council in its 15 June 2007 Message to Parliament "*concerning the continuation of measures relating to civilian peacebuilding and the promotion of human rights*" provides some documentation of how Swiss mediation strategy was meant to be put into action. It set out an intention to increase the number of available experienced mediators and qualified specialists for international mediation teams; intensify research, evaluate findings and exchange know-how with the main players in the areas of mediation and facilitation; create internal education modules for diplomats and mediation experts; and provide Swiss mediators in the field with systematic and structured support.

The work of the MD and its MSP – embodying its implicit theory of change – developed along a number of activity lines, with varying emphasis for each:

- Consultation and process support meant to provide expert capabilities that improve the analysis, planning, and intervention of Swiss and international actors.
- Lessons learned and topical studies meant to ensure that Swiss agents act on the basis of cumulative experience and best practice. Their publication were also meant to help others.
- Training meant to increase the depth and breadth of Swiss capabilities, and also contribute to global mediation capacity.
- Networking and coordination with other mediation support actors meant to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of Swiss and global efforts.
- Financial and technical support for other international, national and sub-national actors meant to provide an additional avenue of indirect intervention.

[†] A **theory of change** is a term often used in this field to describe the links between inputs, the implementation strategy and the intended outputs and outcomes. It describes the assumed or hoped causal relationship between the activity or policy and its (intended) effects on larger peacemaking goals. A theory of change can also be described as a set of beliefs about how and why an initiative will work. Accurate and clearly stated theories of change are necessary for effective programming and should therefore be the subject of evaluation. (EVALUATING CONFLICT PREVENTION AND PEACEBUILDING ACTIVITIES, OECD 2008)

The MD / MSP mechanism itself to some extent also represented a theory of change, intending to aggregate the perspectives, networks, reputations and capabilities of diverse organizations; extend the FDFA's reach and access through Swiss players; and provide reserve resources. Additionally, it was believed that these activities cumulatively would create a readiness and capacity to intervene, as well as build reputation in ways that would create entry points for Swiss assistance.

RESULTS

As the following observations and findings illustrate, the MD's approaches were only partially successful in achieving Swiss peace mediation goals. They have proved notably more successful in reaching objectives oriented towards external stakeholders – those related to assisting other actors to take more constructive action – than they were in reaching objectives that required intense collaboration with internal stakeholders – in particular, to more effectively deploy more Swiss in more meaningful mediation and mediation support roles in international conflicts.

The specific activities and outputs of the MD and MSP are well-documented elsewhere, and are not repeated here. Summaries of the Mediation Activities of PD IV (2000-2011) and of the Completed MSP Outputs (2005-2010) are found in the annexes of this report. It should be noted that while the initial Terms of Reference anticipated general assessments of each category of MD and MSP activity, these have not been provided. First, the relevant data has not been collected by the MD or MSP, for example, on the impact of training activities. A key finding of the evaluation is that attention to evaluation and the learning that comes from it will need to be made a more integral part of future MD and MSP planning and activities. Second, activity-based programming – deciding *a priori* to engage in research, training, and so on – rather than impact-based programming – deciding where to make a difference and rallying the right tools and approaches for doing so – is found to be a weakness of the current system. It is a conclusion of the evaluation that the metrics developed collaboratively as part of the evaluation process and outlined below provide a more actionable framework for assessing relevance, effectiveness, and impact.

Indicia of Success

The institutional context, strategic intent and theories of change underlying the MD and MSP necessitate three sets of metrics (standards of measurement) to assess their relevance and impact.

The first are **internal metrics**: those that look at desired changes within the FDFA. As a result of MD leadership and activities, do diplomats and technical specialists apply enhanced skill, sensitivity and will to find new entry points for Swiss mediation and mediation support? Do Swiss actors systematically apply best practices and lessons from Swiss experience? Do strategic and operational linkages across Swiss actors build the coherence of Swiss policy and intervention? Do these add up to a sustainable structural capacity for enhanced mediation and mediation support?

Next are **external metrics**: those that look at the cumulative impact of MD and MSP leadership and activities on international conflicts. Have Swiss reputation and visibility increased, particularly in ways that encourage international actors to increasingly engage Swiss assistance? Does Switzerland's enhanced expert capacity increasingly provide consultation and process support to mediation processes? Is there evident empowerment of other actors? On the whole, do MD and MSP contributions make a meaningful difference to the quality and cumulative impact of Swiss intervention?

Last are **MSP Metrics**: those that look at the particular mechanism by which many MD programmes and activities are delivered. Does the MSP efficiently produce quality work products? Are these unique, additive contributions? Are coordination and management costs low? Is resource allocation is flexible, responsive to need and appropriate to role? In the aggregate, do institutional memory, quality assurance and continuity improve as a result of the MSP mechanism?

These metrics are used to organize feedback and findings about the relevance and impact of the Swiss FDFA mediation programme.

Reference Cases

The discussion of the relevance and impact of the MD and its MSP begins with the reference cases. Focusing on three different programmes supported by the Desk, these were included as part of the evaluation to permit a more in-depth look at some of the MD's work, in conjunction with more aggregated feedback. They provide narratives of the successes and challenges of the MD's work.

Support of the UN Mediation Support Unit

The Mediation Support Unit (MSU) of the Department for Political Affairs (DPA) at the United Nations (UN) is dependent on outside support to fulfill its mandate. Not only

does it need financial contributions from member states. It requires technical expertise and sometimes simply more hands on deck.

This has opened for Switzerland the opportunity for a close, collegial, and flexible relationship with the MSU. The Mediation Desk provides training to MSU staff. Two Swiss experts have been part of a mission to the Western Sahara, advising the UN Special Envoy on possible alternative approaches to advancing dialogue among the parties. On many occasions, MSU staff have called to “pick the brains” of their Swiss colleagues.

Swiss financial assistance is considered “essential.” But even more so, Switzerland’s “particularly capable actors” – MD, MSP, strategic partners such as HD, and others – have made Switzerland an “extremely important partner” to the MSU.

The advantages to Switzerland of this arrangement are manifold. The first is visibility, supporting the Swiss “brand” in the international mediation space. The second is access to senior officials within DPA and its related special political missions and UN Secretary-General’s Special Representatives. This extends from the MD and MSP to PD IV and the Swiss permanent mission to the United Nations in New York, helping to maintain an important diplomatic channel. The third advantage is in direct support of the Swiss interest in having a healthy, functioning UN system for peace promotion.

It is also hoped that this “special relationship” will lead to further opportunities for Swiss actors. One plan is for staff secondment of Swiss actors to Junior Program Officer positions in DPA. These would provide MD in the short-term with vital information from within about the needs amongst the key UN actors in mediation. They could also help to build up the next generation of experts in the mediation field.

The evaluation finds that the greatest challenge may be keeping Swiss intervention from mirroring the weaknesses of the MSU. Staff within the MSU feel stretched, running from crisis to crisis and managing significant internal bureaucratic demands to the detriment of external analysis, planning and evaluation. So the demands on Swiss partners are varied and sundry, resulting in two days of engagement here, five days of engagement there. Contextual understanding and depth of analysis are necessarily limited, within the MSU and within the constraints of the support the MD can provide.

The evaluation finds that this underlines the value to the MD and MSP of distinguishing between “mediation support” and “support for mediation:”

- **Mediation support** is a term of art, premised on state-of-the art third-party intervention requiring a sustained, focused, expert team, characterized by commitment to ongoing analysis, planning, networking, alignment of third-party efforts, communication and reflection. Complex international mediations will be more successful with structured mediation support.
- **Support of mediation** is very simply that – any advice, resources or activities which arguably helps advance a particular mediation process, or the use of mediation more generally within the international system.

If Swiss assistance to the MSU is limited to “support of mediation” – providing *ad hoc* requested assistance to fill a particular need or gap as defined by the MSU – then the ultimate impact of Swiss assistance will be limited by the substantial organizational challenges faced by the MSU. A constructive role for Switzerland may therefore also be to support reform of the MSU’s approach to its mediation work, moving it closer to the promise of structured and systematic mediation support on which it was founded. This will also likely be true for other Swiss and international actors to whom the MD may provide assistance.

Engagement in Western Papua

To some extent the conflict in Western Papua conflict is frozen, with the Indonesian government continuing to insist that it is battling violent and radical terrorists, rather than Papuans with whom it needs to engage over legitimate political and human rights concerns.

Swiss efforts to open new avenues for peace flow primarily through its partner HD, the Center for Humanitarian Dialogue. HD was invited in 2008 by the then-Defence Minister of Indonesia to look into the situation in Papua amid rising tensions in the region. He suggested cooperating with LIPI (Indonesian Institute of Sciences), where a dedicated research team was already working on how to prevent worsening tensions degenerating into open conflict.

Since 2009, PD IV and HD have been supporting efforts of Father Neles Tebay of the Timur School of Theology and LIPI to reduce the risk of the outbreak of violent conflict in Papua by building support for an inclusive dialogue process. HD conducts in-depth analysis of the conflict, examines barriers to political dialogue, and supports local partners in their research and advocacy agendas. Having a long-term presence on the

ground, HD can sit with a variety of parties, including Papuan advocates and the Indonesian military, even if it can not yet bring them together at the negotiating table. HD works to coordinate third party actors, hosting monthly meetings that so far include a prominent community leader, a local think tank, and the Human Security Advisor (HSA) stationed with the Swiss embassy.

In conjunction with HD, the MD through its MSP conducted a first training on "Mediation and Facilitation" in 2009. Following the workshop, the participants in 2010 formed the Papua Peace Network (PPN). The PPN started a series of popular consultations in Papua that lasted until the end of May 2010. As a result of these consultations the participants requested further training towards a potential dialogue process with the Government of Indonesia, which took place in 2010. Though there are no breakthroughs on the horizon, a foundation is being laid with Swiss support that may facilitate a more productive approach to peace in the future.

The evaluation found Swiss engagement in Western Papua instructive from a variety of perspectives. The first is that it demonstrates the value of strong leadership by the local Swiss ambassador. The HSA position for Western Papua was originally intended for the conflict in Aceh. The Swiss ambassador assessed that there was limited opportunity for constructive engagement there, and advocated for reprogramming towards Western Papua. He also initiated the relationship with HD.

Engagement in Western Papua also underlines the need for political alignment and commitment within the FDFA. There has been some pressure felt from Bern for the Swiss role to be made more visible. But actors on the ground insist that patient investment is indicated, and that any strong push risks backlash from a highly suspicious government in Jakarta. At the same time, there is a fear in the field that there is not real political commitment for risk-taking should the moment for action arise. It is not clear to them that either the necessary resources or the requisite political cover will be forthcoming. They note poor communication and lack of responsiveness between headquarters and the field, which will hamper fast and flexible action should an opportune moment arise.

Finally, and much more positively, the evaluation finds in Western Papua Swiss engagement that is more coherent, multi-faceted, and long-term than elsewhere. PD IV has supported HD over many years; an HSA is on the ground; the Swiss ambassador is engaged; and even episodic MD and MSP engagement can more readily be integrated with local knowledge, understanding, and planning. The various actors actively work to

align their collective efforts. While assessment of ultimate impact is beyond the scope of this evaluation, it can all the same be noted that there is a cogent narrative of how Swiss efforts may help build towards political negotiations in the conflict. As such, Western Papua may constitute an emerging model for MD support of a nascent peace process.

Confidence Building Measures on the Korean Peninsula

The Swiss and Swedish governments, working on the Korean Peninsula together in the Neutral Nations Supervisory Committee since 1953, have seen many ups and downs in developments there. In one such cycle, events in the 5th Round of the Six Party Talks had seemed particularly promising, followed by renewed frustrations that were punctuated by the DPRK nuclear test in October 2006.

The question was raised of how to breath life back into Swiss and Swedish engagement. The respective Ambassadors decided to commission think tanks in Switzerland and Sweden to jointly explore possible confidence building measures. Their 2007 report was well-received by the ROK, US and others. At least initially, no response at all was received from the DPRK.

The following year, the DPRK raised with the Swiss Ambassador its issues with the report. It had not, they said, sufficiently taken into account DPRK perceptions of threats in the region. The Ambassador, operating in a context where Switzerland was often “waiting for a window that might or might not open,” and aware that funding was available from the Political Secretariat in Bern for projects related to security issues, had prepared for this eventuality. He proposed that DPRK academics meet with the report’s authors to discuss their concerns. The DPRK agreed.

The success of the 2009 workshop, attended by four DPRK academics, two from CSS in Switzerland, and two from SIPRI in Sweden, was “mostly in that it took place.” DPRK scholars “agreed to engage on sensitive issues,” and appeared surprised that “moderate Western scholars were eager to hear their views.”

Enough trust was built to facilitate DPRK participation in the MD’s Peace Mediation Course on two occasions, and to proceed with a second workshop in 2010. The second meeting was characterized both by continuity of participation, and by willingness to tackle tougher issues related to the outline for, and possible steps towards, a permanent peace regime for the Peninsula.

The next steps for the process are uncertain. So far, the DPRK has resisted Swiss and Swedish suggestions – made since the first workshop in 2009 – to include other academics, including those from the ROK and US, in the discussion. It is unclear whether this constitutes opposition to the concept, or just a preference to pursue such contact through the variety of other channels available to the DPRK. A “bridging step” is for Swiss and Swedish academics to meet separately with their ROK and US counterparts, initiating a kind of “Track II shuttle diplomacy.”

The evaluation finds it is hard to assess where such an initiative fits into the larger peace facilitation framework for the Korean Peninsula. There are many Track II players; certainly the kinds of multi-national academic meetings proposed by Switzerland have already taken place, facilitated by others. As third party actors tend to “keep things confidential” and “jealously guard their relationships,” initiatives are rarely coordinated, and certainly not jointly analysed or planned as part of a larger whole. There is a sense of competition within a narrow space; even the Swedes are taking action outside of their partnership with Switzerland.

The ability of Switzerland to lead is also in question. DPRK relations are managed by the embassy in Beijing, for whom DPRK relations in general and Track II initiatives in particular can easily fall to “second or third priority.” The Swiss Ambassador only visits Pyongyang twice a year, and “months can go by without meaningful attention to the Track II process.” SDC colleagues in the DPRK can to some extent keep conversations alive, but they must act within the political attention and commitment available.

The evaluation finds that what Switzerland may be left with is an interesting set of episodes and a hope that it contributes to the broadening of perspectives of a growing number of DPRK influentials. The case highlights the degree to which Swiss mediation and facilitation support are dispersed among a variety of FDFA and external players. It reminds us that value can come in a variety of packages: opening new channels and new partners for Swiss diplomacy, contributing to Swiss understanding of a complex conflict, or creating new roles for FDFA’s Swiss partners. It certainly underlines the need for deeper analysis, a more sharply-defined theory of change, more sustained focus, and better connectivity to other third-party players if the ultimate goal is meaningful impact on a peace process.

Specific Findings

Here feedback and findings are organized around the desired results and indicia of success collaboratively developed and set out above. For each, the evaluation determines whether the proposition is strongly supported, supported, contested, or strongly contested by the feedback in the aggregate, or whether the evidence was particularly mixed. (Because each proposition represents a success statement, “strongly supported” correlates to evidence of positive outcomes against the target indicator, and “strongly contested” to lack of evidence of positive outcomes.) Illustrative rather than comprehensive feedback follows each proposition, attempting to communicate a notional consensus view of MD and MSP outputs, outcomes and impact. It is important to note that such feedback provides very good evidence of what is perceived by the respondent group, rather than definitive proof in every case of what is happening.

Internal Metrics

Respondents **contested** the proposition that Swiss actors systematically apply best practices and lessons from Swiss mediation and mediation support experience. Many respondents noted lack of clarity of who constitutes a mediation actor within the FDFA; if it is only designated officials involved in Track I processes, then there would necessarily be few opportunities to apply best practices or lessons learned. SDC, for example, is not clearly considered or integrated as a Swiss mediation or mediation support actor, and peacebuilding advisors (PBAs) reported only sporadic contact with the MD. Best practices and lessons learned are reportedly not easily accessible by diplomats or peacebuilding and human security advisors. There is no network or process for their promulgation or application to specific circumstances. There is limited feedback or input from the MD to plans or field reports of PBAs or others, reducing the MD’s influence. Many noted that it is equally the responsibility of FDFA colleagues to seek out available resources, but that they may have limited knowledge and understanding of the MD and its work and its potential relevance to them.

Respondents **contested** the proposition that Swiss actors apply enhanced skill, sensitivity and will to find new entry points for Swiss mediation and mediation support. It is not improbable that this may occur in the future; numerous Peace Mediation Course attendees remarked that the course enhances the capacity of individuals to be more sensitive to mediation opportunities and increases their ability to identify linkages between traditional peacebuilding work and mediation. But this is not reported as having happened so far. It was noted that initiatives have generally been shaped by

strongly engaged individual diplomats and experts who have acted without MD support. Few saw evidence that any significant number of FDFA colleagues perceived an expectation or possibility that they would identify and cultivate entry points for Swiss mediation or mediation support assistance. Indeed, it was widely reported that there was perceived tension between mediation activities and more “traditional” diplomacy.

Respondents ***strongly contested*** the proposition that strategic and operational linkages across Swiss actors build the coherence of Swiss policy and intervention. Nearly all interviewees reported weak coordination among embassies, peacebuilding advisors, SDC staff, geographic desks, and thematic desks generally. Sub-optimal utilization of existing and potential Swiss mediation resources such as PBAs and the MD were widely reported. Lack of collaborative conflict analysis, joint exploration of challenges and opportunities for Swiss intervention, or linkages among planning for programmes and diplomatic initiatives undermine the possibility for coherent policy and action. The example of Switzerland’s Turkey-Armenia mediation was often raised as an illustration of how appropriate actors are not consulted or included to the detriment of relevance, efficiency and impact. Some linked this to a lack of organizational respect for mediation and mediation support. MD for its part is not seen to be guided by congruent organizational objectives or to consistently communicate or collaborate with relevant stakeholder groups. It is important to note trends with regard to such issues; more recent interventions, such as in Western Papua, provide counterexamples of enhanced alignment and coherence.

Respondents ***contested*** the proposition that enhanced support reflects sustainable structural capacity as well as current personal skill and relationships. While numerous discrete examples of collaboration were reported, these were seen as episodic and relationship-based. Calls for mediation support, training, or other services are attributed to the respect accorded the individual within the MD or MSP, rather than seen as a result of their respective organizational roles. It is reported that MD is often seen as a “coordinator” or “back office” within PD IV and FDFA, rather than as functional expertise that is integral to mediation and facilitation work across the FDFA. This is perceived as a barrier by those who recognize MD and MSP expertise and experience to achieving broader exposure and greater impact across FDFA.

External Metrics

Respondents provided ***mixed feedback*** on the proposition that international actors increasingly engage Swiss mediation and mediation support assistance. The quality and

relevance of workshops – for example, for the UN’s DPA/MSU – is acknowledged and greatly appreciated. But requests for assistance are reported to be largely for training, financial support or other discrete inputs, rather than for mediation or mediation support *per se*. MD and MSP are more typically service providers than thought leaders or strategic partners, limiting the chance of broadening and deepening their role. The personal accomplishments of particular Swiss diplomats and experts are widely recognized and greatly appreciated. Their services remain in demand. But it is noted that this was the case for these Swiss agents before the creation of the MD, and that requests for their individual services can not appropriately be attributed to the MD’s work as such.

Respondents ***strongly contested*** the proposition that Switzerland’s enhanced expert capacity increasingly provides consultation and process support to mediation processes. One of the “broken links” most commonly reported is between the training provided by the Peace Mediation Course and any real-world experience in the realm of mediation or mediation support. It was noted that the work of Special Envoys or designated mediators does not tend to create opportunities for other Swiss agents to raise their profile, skill or experience, or for broader Swiss-led mediation and mediation support activities to emerge. Actors who might be well-positioned to build Switzerland’s portfolio of facilitation and mediation activities, such as PBAs, tend to feel lonely in the roles and insufficiently supported by FDFA leadership. Reflecting on the range of mediation and facilitation activities in the period up until 2005, it is not generally perceived that the establishment of the MD has increased the number of “Track 1” processes of which Switzerland is part.

Respondents provided ***mixed feedback*** on the proposition that the cumulative impact of Swiss efforts has increased. This was mostly a function of the reported lack of congruence among Swiss actors. In particular for those familiar with the DAC criteria, they noted there was unlikely to be *cumulative* impact without some greater degree of coordinated effort. In all three of the reference cases, MD support made a material difference to the quality of the intervention, and as such increased the net positive effect of Swiss intervention. But it is noted that the underlying efforts of which MD is part are themselves often not the product of an in-depth conflict or process analysis or a strategic and clearly-articulated theory of change. It is therefore unclear whether MD activities are focused on key conflict dynamics, or whether any joint effort achieves cumulative *impact*. It is generally suspected that MD interventions are not “big enough or sustained enough” to claim meaningful impact. Again, Western Papua may provide a

counter-example of more deliberate and strategic engagement by and among Swiss actors.

Respondents **supported** the proposition that there is evident empowerment of other actors. Financial contributions are seen as critical, particularly by the UN. NGO partners noted that it is important to have national governments such as the Swiss advocating for the relevance of mediation, creating space for their actions. As a result of MD efforts, parties, for example to the conflict in Papua, feel better prepared for dialogue and negotiations. Participation in peace mediation courses (PMC) reportedly enhances the understanding of mediation and mediation support, and empowers individuals to see professional linkages with mediation.

Respondents provided **mixed feedback** on the proposition that MD and MSP contributions make a meaningful difference to the quality and impact of Swiss intervention. When and where services have been provided, they have been appreciated and acknowledged as both relevant and effective. Insofar as the MD is itself a Swiss actor, its work is additive. Additionally, the MSP mechanism has helped to nurture at least two Swiss organizations who are now more mature actors in the international mediation space, expanding the base of Swiss expertise. But as noted above, weak linkages among players within the FDFA lead many to note that the MD and MSP are often enough irrelevant to mediation or facilitation activities initiated by embassies, thematic desks, special envoys, PBAs, or SDC.

Respondents **supported** the proposition that Swiss reputation and visibility have increased. The flagship peace mediation course is internationally known and respected. Switzerland is “on the map” internationally as a mediation thought leader. It plays a meaningful role in international initiatives such as the development of the OECD DAC guidance. Additionally, certain international dynamics, such as increased international “blacklisting” of non-state armed actors or imposition of sanctions against state actors, enhance the importance for Switzerland and its international partners of Swiss openness to engagement. On the other hand, some note that Swiss reputation and visibility are latent assets, as they have not generally been translated into increased opportunities for engagement in mediation or mediation support, particularly at a “Track 1” level.

MSP Metrics

Respondents **strongly supported** the proposition that the MSP efficiently produces quality work products. Targeted workshops at the UN and specific conflict settings like West Sahara, CAR and Papua are a great success. It is in general greatly appreciated when Swiss expertise come into a dialogue or mediation process to run workshops on processes and substance. Products are typically well-designed and adapted to audiences. MSP is seen to provide particular value in combining research and practice perspectives. Its research products are generally perceived to be of very high quality. No questions are raised about MSP productivity.

Respondents provided **mixed feedback** on the proposition that MSP products are unique, additive contributions. Feedback is strongest on training programmes, which reflect MSP capacity to assess the needs of audiences and design appropriate products. The Peace Mediation Course is often described in positively terms as unique. The mediation support network is seen as a useful forum to learn about the capacity and focus of different members, and to identify gaps and opportunities, though questions are raised about its relevance and sustainability. Knowledge management and research products are viewed with somewhat less certainty. Advances in debriefing and capturing mediator experience are seen as innovative. In some cases, however, the research agenda seems to produce materials that have already been treated elsewhere. It is unclear to many whom the intended audience for knowledge management and research products may be, or how the transition from bookshelf to changes in real-world practice – particularly within the FDFA itself – are intended to be made.

Respondents **supported** the proposition that coordination and management costs are low. The MSP staff are generally perceived as easy to work with, dependably focused on how they can be helpful and capable of independently delivering high-quality products and services. This reduces energies allocated to oversight or other administration. There is some trend, though, towards collaborative challenges. As swisspeace and CSS each establish themselves in the international mediation space independent of the MSP, more thought and energy is required between MD and MSP to distinguish FDFA from partner's other priorities, and to manage the relationship among the MD and MSP partners.

Respondents provided **mixed feedback** on the proposition that resource allocation is flexible, responsive to need and appropriate to role. As individuals and institutions, swisspeace and CSS are responsive and easy to work with. But the MSP structure

provides some pressure to use their resources, rather than working with those who potentially have, for example, greater geographic expertise, thematic depth, or continuity of engagement.

Respondents provided ***mixed feedback*** on the proposition that institutional memory, quality assurance and continuity improve. On the one hand, the building blocks of best practices and lessons learned are increasingly in place. But on the other hand, feedback mirrored perceptions that Swiss actors do not avail themselves of these resources. There is scant evidence of a systematic feedback loop from the MSP back into the FDFA.

In the Aggregate

In the aggregate, feedback paints the picture of a MD that acts among a dispersed and fragmented system of Swiss actors. The brightest spot is its success in raising the visibility and reputation of Switzerland within the international mediation space. A second clear success is in the development and delivery of its training programs. These successes appear linked to the ability of the MD to act reasonably independently and with its own resources within these spheres.

The MD's own external programmatic interventions are largely scattered and episodic, rendering them less likely to be sustainable or well-linked to other national or international actors. As they are often not the product of an in-depth conflict analysis or a strategic and clearly-articulated theory of change, MD activities are uncertain to be focused on key conflict dynamics and unlikely to be "big enough or long enough" to measure up to OECD DAC peacebuilding evaluation standards for relevance, sustainability, or impact. There is evidence of progress against these criteria in Western Papua, however, where a more coherent, sustained, and strategic approach holds some promise for greater impact, as well as a possible model for future interventions.

With limited entry points and relationships within the FDFA, the MD faces significant challenges in meeting the key goal of identifying and cultivating opportunities for great Swiss mediation and mediation support. While the aspiration underlying the MD was to create a catalyst of strategy and planning for Swiss mediation and mediation support activities around which enhanced expertise could be rallied, the MD today for the most part represents substantial expertise responding to varied and sundry requests for external assistance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluation finds that a move from a latent to a more manifest mediation and mediation support capability will first of all require disciplined application of peacebuilding best practices. The FDFA has been an active partner in the development of the OECD DAC guidance, with its emphasis on in-depth conflict and peace process analysis, clear and cogent theories of change, and well-defined indicators. The June 2007 Federal Council Message to Parliament notes from Swiss experience the importance of, *inter alia*, long term commitments, harmonized high-level and civil society initiatives, close cooperation among expert mediators and qualified experts, attention to best practice, and team approaches. Swiss actors clearly have the intellectual foundation to know what is required. Rarely, however, are these principles used to describe the FDFA's current approach to mediation and mediation support. Progress will to some extent turn on the commitment of actors across FDFA taking its own best advice in the FDFA's internal planning and activities to achieve more systematic and structured engagement. This should begin with the development of a logical framework analysis.

The evaluation recommends that the ultimate goal be an FDFA mediation strategy, rather than separate priorities and initiatives across the organization. There is much fear that political will is lacking to tackle difficult and potentially sensitive conflicts. Many share a sense that leaders entertain a "fantasy" that interventions such as Turkey-Armenia can be repeated at will, rather than accepting that mediation roles arising out Switzerland's long-term commitments, as was the case in Nepal, are probably more realistically the norm. Lack of a coherent, agreed understanding of and approach to mediation and mediation support across the FDFA appears to some to be a contributing factor to conflict between PD II and PD IV, and between SDC and the rest of FDFA, slowing responses to external events and hampering effective action. A unified statement of goals and priorities with a clearer sense of the role of each part of the organization in reaching them is a starting point for addressing these concerns. Again, such an approach is beyond the capacity of the MD to implement unilaterally, and will require significant leadership support.

Understanding that the evaluation report is only one among a variety of inputs to MD planning going forward, the following are recommendations that the evaluation found (1) present the greatest potential leverage for progress against the goals identified, and (2) may have the broadest potential for support within the organization.

Implications for the Mediation Desk

1. Build Consensus on the MD Vision, Mission and Focus

The development of a logical framework analysis, following and in light of the final evaluation report and discussions, should be considered the highest priority. At least several days should be devoted to this process, drawing on the analysis and recommendations in the evaluation report and from other sources.

- 1.1. The envisaged logical framework analysis and the further discussions about the evaluation report should be informed by a description and analysis of the current state of international mediation and the key actors involved in mediation, as well as by careful consideration of the future of mediation and mediation support.
- 1.2. If the Swiss government wishes to be active and influential in this field, it needs to address the following questions in a systematic fashion: who does international mediation (e.g. UN, AU, OSCE, sub-regional organisations, certain states)? How do these bodies select their senior mediators and mediations teams? How do the mediators go about mediating? What types of resources do they need (e.g. funding and various kinds of knowledge and expertise)? From where do the mediators currently get these resources? What is the quality of the resources they receive?

The state-of-the-field and future-of-the-field analysis recommended here would assist in identifying gaps (e.g. orphan conflicts, orphan regions, weak or missing elements of mediation processes, weak or missing types of expertise, etc.); it would help the Swiss government to position itself in an increasingly crowded field; it would facilitate the process of determining Swiss objectives and strategies; and it would highlight the need to pursue strategic partnerships with various organisations. In the absence of a state-of-the-field analysis, there can likely be no sensible discussion about “entry points” for the Swiss government.

Comments noted limitations to the logical framework analysis, and rightly note that no planning process gives us control over the uncontrollable. But the need to establish relevant, clear and measurable objectives; state an explicit theory of change and programme logic; complete and monitor a conflict analysis; develop and monitor relevant indicators; focus on strategy and policy coherence; and conduct

systematic, rigorous evaluation (Evaluating Conflict Prevention And Peacebuilding Activities, OECD 2008) cannot be seriously in question. This combined with a transition towards a smaller portfolio of interventions for which there is stronger organizational commitment, described in greater detail in the second recommendation, below, represent significant strides for the MD from activity to impact-based programming.

2. Create Opportunities for Joint Planning & Alignment

The evaluation uncovered fairly widespread willingness of PD IV and other FDFA colleagues to engage in joint examinations of conflicts and third party interventions. Such joint analysis can provide the basis for collaborative learning and joint planning, providing a foundation for greater alignment and political commitment across FDFA for Swiss intervention in current or potential peace processes.

- 2.1. It may be useful for the MD to offer a small portfolio of analytic “products” which can be efficiently delivered within the organization. The most light touch might be a “reflection day,” where MD prepares and facilitates a workshop on a conflict or peace process of interest to Swiss actors. A next step might be an “assessment mission,” broadening the scope of analysis to include stakeholders to a conflict or peace process and third party actors in the field.
- 2.2. A further step might be “scenario development,” exploring challenges and opportunities for Swiss intervention, and presenting a strategy document around which alignment and political commitment for greater engagement could be built at appropriate levels within the FDFA. While it is understood that mediation and mediation support may be “opportunistic” – that is, responsive to real world developments – such an assessment should help define the criteria of what constitutes an opportunity for Switzerland. Criteria may include, for example, the Swiss interests at stake, the likelihood of sustained engagement, the expected involvement of a variety of Swiss actors, a special role for Switzerland as a state actor, and so on, as developed as part of the logical framework analysis.
- 2.3. In select conflicts of strategic interest to Switzerland – whether those already prioritized by the Swiss government through the appointment of a special envoy or otherwise, or in emerging areas of interest identified through MD-facilitated analysis – it may prove useful for the MD to assume the role of providing on-

going “peace process desk” or “mediation support” services. This might include, for example, on-going analysis of the conflict and attempts at peacemaking; careful evaluation of strategic and tactical options for Swiss and other actors; consistent and coordinated outreach to stakeholders and third party intervenors; convening of Swiss players for reflection; and assistance with design and evaluation of any Swiss interventions in light of best practices and Swiss experience. This helps ensure that mediation support best practices become an integral element of Swiss practice.

2.4. It may also be useful for the MD to take a leadership role in funding Swiss actors to provide similar on-going “mediation support” services to strategic partners – for example, the UN DPA or regional economic organizations – who may be active in conflicts of interest to Switzerland and where it would be a priority to increase Swiss involvement.

Among other benefits, the evaluation team believes that this approach will help the MD transition towards a smaller portfolio of interventions for which there is stronger organizational commitment. To be clear, under a limited-resource scenario, the priority should be providing clear proof of concept for structured and systematic mediation support, even if this means working in only one or a very few conflicts or peace processes. With more resources, more conflicts can potentially be addressed, creating more entry points and opportunities for more prominent Swiss engagement. But depth must be valued over breadth of engagement to achieve greater impact and more meaningful progress towards Swiss goals.

It has been noted that this recommendation, the first recommendation on developing the MD Vision, Mission and Focus, above, along with the fifth recommendation, below, to increase MSP engagement within the FDFA do not seem sufficient to achieve the stated goal of an FDFA mediation strategy, rather than separate priorities and initiatives across the organization. The evaluation team concurs, but believes that some further practical progress on collaborative analysis, joint planning, and collective action may be a necessary condition precedent before a broad-based formal planning exercise could be predicted to bear fruit.

3. Develop Human Resources

3.1. Mediation Support

Increasing commitment and skill across FDFA, as well as externally, requires that more people see the relevance of mediation and mediation support to their own work. Very few people the MD or MSP train will become “international mediators.” Many, however, have indicated that they want to and can play supporting roles. The evaluation found a number opportunities for the MD to better support these actors.

- 3.1.1. Given the growing understanding of the need for a “team approach” to international mediation and mediation support, it may be useful for more colleagues to see themselves – as analysts, networkers, or communicators, for example – as part of a more broadly-defined mediation support role. Whether in the Peace Mediation Course or other training, it may be useful – instead of or in addition to training as a general mediator – to provide colleagues training specific to the roles that they may most likely and immediately play in their career ladders and professional development.
- 3.1.2. There may be opportunities to create internal networks of learning and reflection similar to those pursued externally. These would convene Swiss actors who touch on peace processes, facilitation or mediation (for example, MD, MSP, HSA / PSA, PD IV colleagues, Swiss strategic partners, and others) around topical themes or emerging issues of immediate relevance to their work.

Such human resource development must be premised on a clear and compelling concept for mediation support. While the MD launch represented a pilot phase for mediation support, both within the FDFA and internationally, the time appears ripe for a clear statement of the state-of-the-art and future aspirations for mediation support as a standard against which capabilities can be built.

3.2. Mediation

To the extent that the goal as set out by the Federal Council in its 15 June 2007 message to Parliament to “increase the number of available experienced mediators” remains relevant, significant consideration must be given to the

methods by which the expert mediation capacity will be increased. The clear message from the feedback is that training is by itself insufficient. The value of an enhanced strategic focus emphasized in the findings and recommendations, above, in part addresses this need, as it will make more likely more central Swiss roles in conflicts in which Switzerland offers more systematic support. Opportunities should also be sought to leverage the work of high-level Swiss facilitators and mediators to create opportunities for other Swiss agents to raise their profile, skill or experience, or for broader Swiss-led mediation and mediation support activities to emerge.

4. Recognize and Plan for the Variety of MD Roles

The evaluation underlines that the MD plays a variety of distinct roles within FDFA: “thematic,” “expert,” and “programmatic.” Greater distinction among these roles may lend clarity to prioritization and planning.

- 4.1. In light of emerging understanding, it will be important to define the Swiss point of view on mediation support as a thematic area. Based on that understanding, activities can be prioritized – among current and potential research and publication support, the flagship PMC, funding of international partners, international advocacy, etc. – that are most useful and important to promoting the Swiss perspective. It should be clear in the MD budget which resources (human and financial) are specifically allocated for visibility and advocacy, along with the attendant goals and metrics.
- 4.2. Enhanced staffing and other resources are required to pursue a stronger and more consistent consulting and “peace process desk” or “mediation support” role within FDFA. These should be planned for both for a transitional or proof of concept phase, and as an on-going investment that can be made as opportunities for enhanced Swiss intervention are identified.
- 4.3. It will be imperative to guard senior expert resources jealously and deploy them for maximum impact. They are of greatest service to Swiss interests as consultants and advisors, rather than, for example, as programme administrators or training coordinators. It was often enough pointed out that some interests can be adequately met by writing a check, while other interests require substantial and sustained engagement of more senior staff.

The evaluation suggests that, as a matter of principle, the MD should not have a project or programme that is not strongly aligned to other Swiss activities and interests in mediation and mediation support. Training should not be provided in isolation by the MD *qua* MD, except as it impacts visibility and reputation. To do otherwise risks dilution of effort and lack of coherence, sustainability, and impact.

Implications for the Mediation Support Project

It is acknowledged that the evaluation has emphasized recommendations for the MD and the FDFA system within which the MD operates. It has less to offer for the MSP or concerning the relationship between the MD and the MSP. This is because greater clarity of vision and a more developed strategy is required for the MD before sensible analysis and advice can be provided for the MSP. Insofar as the MSP is one of a variety of mechanisms by which the MD achieves its objectives, the “what” of the MD must be defined before the “how” of the MSP can be optimally designed and implemented. All the same, certain reflections are offered.

5. Support for Enhanced Facilitation, Mediation & Peace Process Support

Should the FDFA pursue the preceding recommendations, one natural role for the MSP may be to support MD analytic engagement with FDFA, other Swiss, and international partners.

5.1. The MSP can help identify and develop the assets or capabilities that can be usefully deployed to support efficient, useful joint learning and analysis across FDFA related to select conflicts of particular interest, supporting the “reflection days” or “assessment missions” outlined above.

5.2. The MSP can usefully develop tools or frameworks that would inform evaluation of opportunities for Swiss intervention and balancing of risks and benefits from a Swiss perspective, consistent with the “scenario development” outlined above.

5.3. The MSP can usefully support networking or joint learning among the variety of Swiss actors engaged in facilitation or mediation activities (special envoys, PBAs, thematic desks, certain diplomats and experts), helping them to effectively and efficiently promote greater reflection and create receptive audiences for best practices and lessons from Swiss experience.

5.4. In conflicts, peace processes, or mediations of priority interest to Switzerland, the MSP may usefully play a “peace process desk” or “mediation support” function on an on-going basis for a particular conflict, helping to create and maintain a locus of expertise, analysis, networking, reflection and evaluation of value to a variety of Swiss and international actors.

All of these proposals add up to a recommendation to transition from activity-based to impact-based programming. Such roles give greater substance to the “mediation support” component of the Mediation Support Project, allowing it to draw on substantial institutional strengths and differential capabilities to provide on-demand services in support of more effective Swiss intervention. It may also be anticipated that such concentrated, expert Swiss attention to particular conflicts may increase the likelihood of more prominent Swiss roles emerging.

Implications for the MD / MSP Relationship

6. Increase Integration Around Analytic Functions

The access, trust and working relationships necessary to the advisory services outlined for the MSP above can only be built through structured, productive, and helpful interactions, and should be based on a long-term partnership.

Where the functions being played by the MSP are potentially (a) high impact; (b) provided with greater efficiency and expertise by an outsourced partner; (c) anticipated to be on-going; (d) require highly trusting relationships with FDFA staff; and (e) require integration with internal processes, increased integration into the FDFA with the anticipation of a long-term relationship will be valuable. Examples might include collecting and analysing lessons from Swiss experience; facilitating internal analysis and planning sessions; providing a “peace process desk” or “mediation support” function for a particular conflict; or managing and delivering the flagship PMC.

7. Decrease Integration Around Programme Functions

Not all valuable support activities, however, need to be part of the fabric of the FDFA. Where functions and activities (a) require less integration with internal systems and processes; (b) are less dependent on long-term relationships with FDFA staff; and (c) are not necessarily part of an on-going process, a variety of

partners can be considered for their delivery. Such activities might include, for example, research or practice notes; general capacity building activities; or analyses within a particular geography or context. In such cases, there should not be a presumption that support will be provided by the MSP, and greater effort may be made to ensure the optimal fit of resource to need. The evaluation finds this largely to be the current practice of the MD, and supports the continuation and refinement of such efforts.

8. Maintain a System that Works

The evaluation considered significant reflection on the pros and cons of continuing the MSP relationship with MD at all. The conclusion of the evaluation on this point is a pragmatic one. There are strong FDFA and international networks and relationships, significant tacit knowledge, and evident collegial respect and mutual support embedded in the current system. The MD is about to enter into a new phase of consolidation, experimentation, and adaptation to achieve its clarified goals. The evaluation concludes that this is an inopportune time to prioritize organizational issues, and would therefore recommend continuation of the current arrangement for the next phase of the MD's development.

IN CONCLUSION

The feedback in this evaluation may to some appear quite blunt. There are a few reasons for this, all of which reflect positively on the Mediation Desk, the Mediation Support Project, and their colleagues across FDFA.

The FDFA has set its sights very high: a notable increase in Swiss contributions to mediations that transform international conflicts. The higher the bar, the greater the apparent gap will be. The evaluation confirms that this the FDFA has indeed set an ambitious goal, but also suggests that it is one within the capacity of the FDFA to achieve.

All persons consulted have been exceptionally open and transparent in their assessments. They have chosen to raise and address difficult issues rather than see them papered over. This has been true for none more than MD and MSP colleagues themselves.

Finally, the evaluation team has been instructed to focus its energies on advice for improving the impact of the MD and MSP in the future. Given the foundation in place, the evaluation team can only fulfil this mandate by pushing our colleagues to even greater accomplishments.

The evaluation team hopes it has helped to generate useful and actionable insight through this report and its collaboration with MD, MSP, PD IV, and FDFA colleagues. As much as you may have learned from us, we have learned from and with you.

ANNEXES

Summary of Mediation Activities PA IV (2000-2011)	33
Completed MSP Outputs (2005-2010).....	39
Constructed Logical Framework Analysis	49
List of Persons Consulted.....	50
Evaluator Biographies	51

Summary of Swiss Mediation Activities (2000-2010)

An Overview for the Purpose of the MSP/MD Evaluation (Spring 2011)

Ref	Country	Time	Type of activity	Activities
1	Armenia-Turkey	2009	Direct Mediation / facilitation	Upon request of both countries, Armenia and Turkey, Switzerland supported the two countries in their attempt to normalize their diplomatic relations, open the borders and set up commissions that look into a variety of issues including the events of 1915. The protocols, which were signed in October 2009 in Zurich, have not yet been ratified by the Parliaments of the two countries. Switzerland is still engaged in supporting the process, i. a. with confidence building measures.
2	Burundi	2000-2008	Support of Peace Processes with Experts	Switzerland supported the peace talks that led to the Arusha Accords of 2000. Since then, it has financially supported the Switzerland based NGO "Initiative of Change" that helped the South African mediators in the talks between the last remaining rebel group and the government of Burundi. A ceasefire agreement was signed in 2008. A Swiss PBA has supported these activities.
3	Central African Republic	2008	Capacity Building	Together with HD and UN-MSU, Switzerland facilitated a seminar on dialogue and peace negotiations for the government, the opposition movements and the rebels in the Central African Republic.
4	Colombia	2000-2002 and 2003-2008	Direct Mediation	Together with other states, Switzerland supported the peace process between the Colombian Government and the FARC. After its breakdown, Switzerland - together with Spain and France - was mandated to facilitate a humanitarian agreement between the government and the FARC. The talks broke down with the liberation of Ingrid Betancourt.
		2002-2008	Direct Mediation/facilitation	Switzerland facilitated a number of meetings (talks about talks) between the ELN and the Government of Colombia that were conducted in La Habana since December 2005, where Switzerland acted as a third party together with Norway and Spain. The talks broke down in 2008.
5	DR Congo	2001-2006	Support of Peace Processes with Experts	From 2001 to 2006, Switzerland supported the Inter-Congolese Dialogue (ICD). Two experts from PD IV were put at the disposal of DRC for structuring the facilitation of the ICD.
6	Cyprus	2004	Direct Mediation/ facilitation	Switzerland facilitated the Cyprus Peace Talks at Bürgenstock in 2004. The talks were successful, but the agreement was later rejected by the Greek Cypriots in a referendum.
		2002-2004	Support of Peace Process with Experts	Switzerland supported the UN mediation of the Cyprus Peace talks by seconding an expert. He was the head of the legal expert group and the deputy of Alvaro de Soto, UN Special Advisor to the Secretary General.
7	Georgia	2002-2006	UN Mediation	A Swiss Ambassador was the UN Special Representative for Georgia and was directly involved in the mediation of talks between the Government of

		2002-2010 2008 2009-2011-	Facilitation of Track 1.5 talks Facilitation Good Offices and Facilitation	<p>Georgia and the de facto Abkhazian Government and the implementation of CBMs.</p> <p>Switzerland supported financially the NGO Conciliation Resources which facilitated track 1.5 talks between elites and officials from Georgia and Abkhazia.</p> <p>After the war in South Ossetia in August 2008, the EU mandated an Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on the Conflict in Georgia (IIFMCG) to explore the causes and the development of the conflict, in order to consolidate the situation between the parties to the conflict. A Swiss Ambassador was in the lead of the mission.</p> <p>Switzerland is mandated by Georgia and Russia to represent their interests in Moscow and Tbilisi, respectively.</p> <p>In this context Switzerland was asked to mediate the negotiations of Russia's request for WTO membership, which Georgia opposes.</p>
8	Guatemala	2003	Implementing a Peace Agreement	A Swiss "dealing with the past" expert assisted the government and civil society actors to negotiate and establish a "compensation fund" for victims of war.
9	Guinea	2010-2011	Capacity Building	Together with a Swiss PD IV expert and International Alert, MSP (swisspeace & CSS) conducted four workshops on capacity building for local election mediators in Guinea. In 2011 MSP supported a workshop on lessons learned and best practice.
10	Indonesia – Papua Indonesia - Aceh	2008- 2005	Comprehensive Support and Capacity Building Coaching	<p>Since 2008, main actors from West Papua are engaged in preparing a dialogue process with Jakarta to get a genuine autonomy in order to settle the conflict. Father Neles is coordinating this process in partnership with the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI). The Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue (HD) is facilitating the process. From the outset, Switzerland has supported these efforts financially as well as in substance. A Swiss Human Security Adviser is involved in the process. Up to now, PD IV – together with MSP – implemented three capacity building workshops on peace negotiations and their main topics (power sharing, wealth sharing, institution building), and one on conflict mapping for the movements of Papua.</p> <p>The parties to the conflict and the mediator asked Switzerland to assist the GAM in formulating its positions in the negotiations for a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) in the process led by Maarti Athissari. The coaching was successful, a MoU was signed, and elections were held.</p>
11	Iran	2006-2009	Direct Mediation/facilitation	Since spring 2006, Switzerland is mediating a dialogue regarding Iran's nuclear programme. In this role, Switzerland profited from its status as a neutral country that has no hidden agenda, from its know-how regarding nuclear technology and from its privileged access to both sides (Good offices). These mediation efforts resulted in a meeting in Geneva on 19 July 2008 at which, for the first time in years there was

				direct contact between Iran and the US (Geneva Talks I). Switzerland also organised new talks between the EU 3+3 (Germany, France, Great Britain, USA, Russia and China) and Iran in Geneva (Geneva Talks II) in October 2009 and November 2010.
12	Kyrgyzstan	2011-	Facilitation	Together with International Alert, Switzerland facilitates the National Dialogue for Kyrgyzstan which is a consequence of the political crises and the ethnically based riots in the south of the country in 2010. Members of the main parties, including the government and opposition, of the civil society and religious leader take part in the dialogue.
13	Macedonia	2005	Implementation of a Peace Agreement	The Swiss Ambassador, supported by PER (Project on Ethnic Relations) initiated the so-called Mavrovo Process, and convened regular meetings between all parties and the Government in order to discuss the implementation of the Ohrid Agreement.
14	Middle East	2003 2005-2007	Facilitation of Peace Processes on track 1.5	Since 2002, Switzerland facilitated the <u>Geneva Initiative</u> (GI), a typical track 1.5 process, in which members of the Palestinian Authority were involved on the Palestinian and influential elites on the Israeli side. The GI was signed in December 2003 in Geneva. It helped to trigger the withdrawal from Gaza and will be a reference for any comprehensive peace accord in the future. Since then, Switzerland supported the development of several model agreements on specific topics that have been developed by the GI initiators (Jerusalem, refugees, water, etc.) <u>Israel/Syria</u> : Switzerland supported meetings between Israelis and Syrians in Switzerland. Some of the Syrians were high placed Government officials, whereas the Israelis were from the civil society. Both the governments of Syria and Israel were informed about the talks.
15	Nepal	2005-2006 2006 -	Direct Mediation/facilitation, Track I Support of Peace Processes with Experts	A Swiss expert (Special Adviser for Peace Building) played a decisive role in discreetly supporting the peace process between the Seven Party Alliance (SPA) and the Maoists. He did so by facilitating contacts between the SPA and the Maoists and contributing considerably to the development and structuring of the peace process and to the drafting of individual agreements. Since the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Accord concluded between the Government of Nepal and the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) on 21 November 2006, a Swiss expert has been supporting the parties in the difficult task of implementing the agreement, namely mediating and facilitating on a track-1.5-level. The expert is active in assisting to draft a new constitution, in state restructuring, in providing expertise on democratic oversight over the security forces and in the area of integration and rehabilitation of the former PLA combatants as well as in Dealing with the Past. A Swiss expert is advising on the future federal structure of the country. In February 2011, Switzerland facilitated a meeting of

				the three leading parties in Nepal that took place in Switzerland.
16	North Korea	2007-	Exchange of views on Track II with observers from Track I	The Swiss and Swedish MFA mandated a report on CBMs related to the Korean Peninsula due to their historical involvement in the “Neutral Nations Supervisory Committee.” In 2009 and 2010, academics from CSS, SIPRI and the DPRK “Institute for Disarmament and Peace” met to exchange views on the developing peace and security situation related to the Korean Peninsula and how a peace process could be shaped. These meetings were facilitated by MSP and a Swedish NGO.
17	Somalia	1998 2000 2002 2008 2011 2010 2011	Direct Mediation/facilitation, seconding expert	<p>A Swiss expert was dispatched to Garowe to help the Puntland Regional authorities draft the first Charter that was to establish the road map for the creation of a federal state within the future federal model of Somalia. agreed upon within the Arta Peace Agreement in 2000.</p> <p>An expert on constitutional issues was made available to help the Somalis (of all walks) to think through a institutional or constitutional building process after over 10 years of absence of a Government.</p> <p>In parallel, the same expert was asked to work on the Somaliland Constitution and the referenda process in which the Constitution was ratified.</p> <p>A Constitutional Expert was made available to run the 1st Committee of the IGAD Talks on the building of the Federal Charter which will be signed in 2004 and implemented until today, by the Transitional Federal Government.</p> <p>A Constitutional Expert was made available to help the TFG draft the Federal Constitution of Somalia, which is currently out for consultation within the UNPOS. Irregular informal talks have been taking place with various armed groups not included in the Federal Charter or the Djibouti Agreement of 2008.</p>
18	Sri Lanka	2006	Direct Mediation/facilitation Funding of NGO	<p>Switzerland acted twice as host for talks between the LTTE and the Government of Sri Lanka in Geneva in February and October 2006, supporting the official facilitator Norway also in substantive areas. While in the first round both parties committed to respect and uphold the Ceasefire Agreement, the talks failed to stop the escalating war after the change of government.</p> <p>Switzerland supported the Berghof Foundation that was engaged in Track 1.5 mediation activities from 2001 – 2007 in Sri Lanka. Berghof facilitated workshops and meetings between elites and members of the civil societies across the conflict divide and the common development of thematic solutions, for instance of federal structures and constitutional amendments.</p> <p>From 2005 onwards, Switzerland contributed with financial and technical assistance to the Sri Lanka One</p>

				-Text Initiative, which was co-founded by the country's main political parties to facilitate dialogue, strengthen relationships and enable a structured exchange of ideas/options between the nation's political stakeholder groups.
19	Sudan	2002 2002-2005 2005-2006	Direct Mediation, Lead mediator (co-mediation with US) Support of Peace Processes with Experts Track I Capacity Building	<p>In 2002, a Swiss Ambassador led the Swiss-US mediation team on the Bürgenstock for the successful negotiations of the ceasefire agreement of the Nuba Mountains, thus preparing the ground for the North – South negotiations that were to follow.</p> <p>A Swiss expert was a key member of the mediation team in the IGAD peace process that led to the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, after three years of negotiations, ending a war that killed over 2 million people.</p> <p>A Swiss expert drafted the Power Sharing Protocol within the Abuja Peace Process for the Darfur, before the decision was taken for Switzerland to withdraw [End of January 2006].</p> <p>A Swiss Expert (Special Adviser for Peace Building) supported the peace process led by the African Union and the UN in Darfur by introducing the relevant rebel movements of Darfur to the techniques and topics of peace negotiations and indicating possible solutions that might be negotiated. In 2008/2009, three seminars with the rebel movements were implemented. In 2010, Swiss experts organised capacity building workshops for the movement during the peace talks in Doha.</p>
20	Tajikistan	2002-2011	Post agreement phase / Implementing a Peace Agreement on Track 1	Switzerland supported track 1.5 dialogue and joint projects between the secular government and Islamic actors. The result was a document on “confidence-building measures” that established principles of co-existence and mechanisms of peaceful conflict transformation between all parties when dealing with religious, legal and political issues. Concrete policy recommendations and projects were designed to implement the “confidence-building measures”, and several working groups were founded.
21	Thailand	2010-2011 2010-2011	Funding of NGO, and Co-actor	<p>Switzerland supports the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue in establishing “The Friends of Thailand”. This is an informal grouping which provides a forum for members of all political parties to exchange their views on the political crisis between “reds and yellows” (modernization conflict) and to contribute to a peaceful and sustainable resolution. The Swiss Ambassador plays a crucial role in supporting the dialogue.</p> <p>Switzerland also supports the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue in the facilitation of a dialogue between the Government and the Islamic Movements of South Thailand, including the armed groups, and the establishment of peace structures (“Study Group”). At the same time, Switzerland supports the Berghof project “Insider Mediators”. The objective of this project is to nurture and support a key group of Insider Mediators engaged to peacefully transform the conflict in the South. The aim is to make best use of the</p>

				emerging opportunities for peaceful change and to help establish suitable mechanisms which will enable Insider Mediators to collaborate effectively with each other and to work towards a cumulative and complementary impact on the peace process.
22	Uganda	2006-2007	Support of Peace Processes with Experts, Track I	Switzerland was asked by the Government of Southern Sudan to provide an expert in the peace process between the Lord Resistance Army (LRA) and the Government of Uganda; a difficult process because the ICC has indicted Josef Kony and four of his commanders. The Swiss expert was decisive in designing and phasing the whole process. He also drafted the agreement on cessation of hostilities that was to be signed in April 2006 and led to an increase in security for civil society in Northern Uganda. The peace process failed, however, as Josef Kony did not sign the final peace agreement.
23	Western Sahara	2010-	Support of Peace Processes with Experts, Track I	Two Swiss experts were put at the disposal of the Personal Envoy of the Secretary General of the UN for Western Sahara, Mr. Christopher Ross, to improve the mediation process between the delegations from the Kingdom of Morocco and the Frente Polisario.
24	Mediation Support Project	Since 2005	Funding of NGOs and close collaboration in mediation support	<p>Switzerland initiated the Mediation Support Project (MSP) run by swisspeace and Centre for Security Studies (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich) in 2005. MSP is mainly in charge of research, training, support and capacity building, networking. PD IV and MSP offer a variety of training courses in international mediation, including a basic course (Peace Mediation Course) and topical workshops for UN employees in New York.</p> <p>PD IV and MSP offer capacity building in various peace processes with the aim of training parties to conflicts in the methods and techniques of peace negotiations.</p> <p>Switzerland increases the efficiency of mediation by developing a mediation methodology based on experiences from mediators of the Swiss FDFA, drawing up guidelines regarding various mediation topics for the UN and the mediators and exploiting the lessons learned in mediation.</p>
25	Cooperation with UN DPA Mediation Support Project	2006-	Funding and seconding staff	Switzerland makes financial contributions to the UN (Mediation Support Unit of the Department of Political Affairs) of an annual amount of USD 500'000-600'000, makes staff available to the UN in New York (JPOs) and supports its peace mediation missions with experts (Western Sahara).
26	Cooperation with NGOs		Funding of NGOs	Switzerland supports selected NGOs specialised in mediation such as the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue (HD) and the Kofi Annan Foundation in Geneva, Conciliation Resources (CR) in London and the Berghof Foundation in Berlin, and cooperates with them in various processes and projects.

MMZ, 1 July 2011

Completed MSP Outputs 2005 - 2010

An Overview for the Purpose of the MSP/MD Evaluation (Spring 2011)[‡]

1. Research

a) Outputs in 2005 and 2006 (1st Contract Cycle)

#	Topic	Output	Written Reports?
1	<i>Study on Determinants of Effective Mediation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Work plan written and shared with PD IV ▪ Interviews and summaries of 13 PD IV cases ▪ Overview of constitutional questionnaires ▪ Further development into 4-page overviews began, to be continued in the coming phase 	16 cases finalized by August 2007
new [§]	<i>In depth study on PD IV experiences in Sudan</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 50 page overview, printed in Bulletin 2006 zur schweizerischen Sicherheitspolitik 	See: http://www.css.ethz.ch/publications/serien_EN (eng. version in drop box)

b) Outputs in 2007 (2nd Contract Cycle)

#	Topic	Output	Written Reports?
1	Capitalisation of PDIV experiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The 16 most significant past PDIV mediation engagements are assessed and updated. ▪ Short summaries for further cases are being established 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
3a	Topical expertise 2 Mediation & Religion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Joint project with J. N. Bitter of PDIV. ▪ Article written, role play designed, tested, and used. ▪ One-day workshop organized for PDIV. ▪ Presentation at CSS colloquium. 	Draft available on demand, was used in later publications
5a	Study on CBMs in relation to the Korean Peninsula	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Collaboration with SIPRI on the study, financed by the Swiss VBS and EDA (PD II) and Swedish MoFA. ▪ Online at www.korea-cbms.ethz.ch. ▪ Presentation in Zurich (Amb. Combernois) 	See: www.korea-cbms.ethz.ch

[‡] This overview is based on the final MSP reports handed in to PDIV. It contains all the completed MSP activities carried out from August 2005 – December 2010.

Additional reports (as indicated in the tables) can be accessed on the „Dropbox“ Shared drive provided by MSP (contact: Matthias.Siegfried@swisspeace.ch)

[§] “New” refers to those activities that have been planned and implemented in addition to the ones outlined and foreseen in the original MSP project proposal.

		<p>present), NZZ and Tages-Anzeiger articles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Study was adopted into the UN MSU pool: http://peacemaker.unlb.org/doc_view.php?d=1006 	
5b	Development of Mediation methodology	<p>Various publications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mediation in Friedens-prozessen (in: "perspektive mediation", 2007/4). ▪ Médiation et facilitation dans les processus de paix actuels (OIF background text). ▪ Mediation and Facilitation in Peace Processes ** ▪ Promises and Pitfalls of Mediation between State and Armed Non-State Actors (ISF report). ▪ Mediators in need of a Mediator? (KOFF newsletter). 	<p>See:</p> <p>http://www.css.ethz.ch/publications/workingpapers_EN</p> <p>http://www.swisspeace.ch/typo3/topics/mediation/resource_s.html</p> <p>http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Digital-Library/Publications/Detail/?id=114816&lng=en</p>

c) Outputs in 2008 and 2009 (3rd Contract Cycle)

#	Topic	Output	Written Reports?
2	Developing mediation methodology	<p>Articles and Speeches on methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Background work for various DPIV speeches 2) Insider Mediators. Exploring Their Key Role in Informal Peace Processes study written with Berghof 3) To Be a Negotiator, strategies and tactics, by Gen. Sumbweiwo 4) Mediation Support Project (MSP): Massgeschneiderte Verstärkung der schweizerischen Mediationskapazitäten. Article published in CSS Bulletin 5) Evaluating Peace Mediation, with CMI 	<p>See:</p> <p>http://www.css.ethz.ch/publications/workingpapers_EN</p> <p>http://www.swisspeace.ch/typo3/topics/mediation/resource_s.html</p>
3	Developing mediation topical expertise	<p>Mediation overlap with topics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Mediation Essentials: Dealing with the past and Peace Mediation: PDIV guidance note 2) Mediation Essentials: Federalism and Peace Mediation 3) Mediation Essentials: Decentralization and Peace Mediation 4) Religion: working paper drafted on Danish Mohamed Caricature 5) Linking Environment and Conflict Prevention: the Role of the United Nations: study finished, two trips to New York to present draft and finalized version (workshop with Jan Egeland) 6) IDPs: Subversion or Reinvention? Dilemmas and Debates in the Context of UNHCR's Increasing Involvement with IDPs. Article published in 'Journal of Refugee Studies'. 	<p>See:</p> <p>http://peacemediation.ch/resources/</p> <p>http://www.css.ethz.ch/publications/index_EN</p> <p>http://www.swisspeace.ch/typo3/topics/mediation/resource_s.html</p>

** <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Current-Affairs/ISN-Insights/Detail?lng=en&id=123028&contextid734=123028&contextid735=123891&tabid=123891>

		7) Involving IDPs in the Darfur Peace Process. Article published in 'Forced Migration Review'.	
6	Developing mediation case expertise	Brochures: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Unpacking the mystery of mediation in African peace processes. Study published, for 'PDIV Annual Conference' 2) South Sudan Study, research in collaboration with COTAL 3) Towards Realizing the Strengths and Mitigating the Challenges of NGO Mediators. Final Report of Consultation Process 	See: http://www.css.ethz.ch/publications/workingpapers_EN http://www.swisspeace.ch/typo3/topics/mediation/resource_s.html
	Developing mediation case expertise	Articles: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The tormented triangle: regional conflict dynamics in Darfur, Chad, Car. Article ready but not yet published. 2) Conflict Management and Opportunity Cost: The International Response to the Darfur Crisis. Article published in 'FRIDE Comments'. 3) Complicating Darfur. Review of de Waal, Alex 'War in Darfur and the Search for Peace', published in 'Fletcher Forum of World Affairs'. 4) Vertrauensbildende Massnahmen für die Koreanische Halbinsel. Article published in CSS Bulletin 5) Der Fall Gontard und die Privatisierung der Schweizer Aussenpolitik. Weshalb wir private Friedensdiplomaten brauchen. Article about the role of the private mediators in the Tagesanzeiger 	See: http://www.css.ethz.ch/publications/workingpapers_EN http://www.swisspeace.ch/typo3/topics/mediation/resource_s.html
5	Leaning about Mediation Support	Study on mediation support mechanisms: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Debriefing mediators – to learn from their experiences", short article paid by USIP, printed early 2010. 2) Short video clips interviewing mediators (three clips done and online: www.peacemediation.ch) 	See: http://www.swisspeace.ch/typo3/topics/mediation/resource_s.html http://peacemediation.ch/resources

d) Outputs in 2010 (4th Contract Cycle)

#	Topic	Output	Written Reports?
3	Developing mediation topical expertise	Mediation overlap with topics: Research and articles on the overlap of mediation with other topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transforming conflicts with religious dimensions, methodologies and practical experiences^{††} 	http://www.css.ethz.ch/publications/workingpapers_EN
7	Guidance Notes	Guidance notes , Issues brief, memos, checklists, summaries, etc.	http://www.swisspeace.ch/typo3/topics/mediation/resource_s.html

^{††} This is joint publication by CCDP, Swiss FDFA and CSS, with funding from the "Religion, politics, conflict" desk of the Swiss FDFA. Salary time of Simon Mason for the original workshop was covered by MSP.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance note on “Business Actors In Peace Mediation”, finalized 15 Nov 2010^{##} • Decentralization and peace mediation 	s.html Collection of guidance notes: http://www.peacemedia.ch/resources/essentials.htm
--	--	---	--

2. Training

a) Outputs in 2005 and 2006 (1st Contract Cycle)

#	Topic	Output	Written Reports?
2	<i>Baseline Study “Training in Mediation”</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Online Baseline Study up and running 	See: http://www.swisspeace.ch/typo3/topic-areas/mediation/who-is-who.html
4	<i>Contribution to SEP Course 2005</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MSP was part of the “Core Team” during the entire SEP course in September 	No final report Course Documents available upon request
5	<i>Planning and organisation of PD IV workshop in fall 2005</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Workshop in October 2005 on “Mediative Peacebuilding Engagements” implemented in Montreux (with PD IV) 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
new	<i>International Training Workshop: Nile Capacity Building Forum</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organization and training of trilateral PAMS workshop on water conflict transformation, negotiation and mediation, with Sudanese, Ethiopian and Egyptian participants, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia 30 Jan-3 Feb 2006 (in cooperation with NCCR) 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
new	<i>Various workshops and teaching activities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MSP was invited to (co) organise various teaching and training event. ▪ These were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OSCE training in Vienna (June) - University of Bern (April) 	No reports

b) Outputs in 2007 (2nd Contract Cycle)

#	Topic	Output	Written Reports?
6	Ambassadors' Retraite 2006 + 2007 Mediation & Facilitation in Peace Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Retreat planned and organised (a joint venture between PDIV, MSP, and Center for Humanitarian Dialogue (HDC)). ▪ Two-day retreats took place in August 2006 and 2007 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
7	Swiss Peacebuilding Training Course 2006 and 2007 Co-organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Course planned and organised (a joint venture between PDIV, GCSP, MSP, and SWISSINT). ▪ MSP played an active part in the “Steering Committee” and the “Core Team” of the SEP 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive

^{##} This publication was funded additionally by PDIV (Mediation Desk and *Human Security and Business Desk*)

		2006 and 2007 throughout the entire course (two weeks).	
8	Mediation Workshop for Swiss diplomats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop took place on 1 and 2 February 2007 at Schloss Hüningen, as a joint venture between PDIV, MSP and HDC. 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
9	Atelier sur la Mediation pour l'Organisation internationale de la Francophonie (OIF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop took place in January 2007 (a joint venture between the OIF, PDIV, PDIII, GCSP, and MSP). MSP input: logistics, and article as basis for T. Germinger's talk. 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
10a	Occasional input to other training events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-organisation of two-day workshop for the "Internationale Diplomatenausbildung" organised by Viadrina University and the "Auswärtiges Amt" (Germany). Input to a mediation course at the "Fachhochschule Winterthur". Key note speech "Mediation and conflict prevention" at a workshop organised by the Austrian Landesverteidigungskademie in Vienna (9–11 November 2006). 	No reports (powerpoints and workshop contributions available upon request)
10c	UN Training module	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training module on "Mediation and Federalism & Decentralisation". Workshop took place in December 2007. A joint venture between PDIV, Swiss experts and MSP. 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive

c) Outputs in 2008 and 2009 (3rd Contract Cycle)

#	Topic	Output	Written Reports?
7	UN Topic Mediation Module	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Two day mediation workshop on "Dealing with the Past and Mediation" took place in December 2008 Two day mediation workshop on "Wealth sharing and economic issues" took place in December 2009 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
9	SEP Course 2008 Co-organisation	MSP in the role of Co-Director of the "Swiss Peacebuilding Training Course" together with the GCSP for the Expert pool	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
11	Occasional inputs in other training events	<p>MSP provided occasional inputs in selected training events organised by other organisations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mediation training for Georgians and Abkhaz with Viadrina University and the "Auswärtiges Amt" (Germany) GCSP mediation training Fachhochschule Winterthur Negotiation training for VBS special forces VBS 	No reports (powerpoints and workshop contributions available upon request)
13	Peace Mediation Course	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Three week course took place in 2008 for the first time: collaboration MSP and PDIV, www.peacemediation.ch Second course, this time two times 7 days, took place in March and June 2009 (done) 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive

New	DCAF course	8 day course “Integrating Security Issues in Peace Agreements” workshop for DCAF	See: http://peacemediation.ch/dcaf and Dropbox Shared Drive
New	OSCE	Advised OSCE on mediation retreat, training,	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
New	e-learning	Two e-learning modules developed with ISN, on mediation and negotiation, further modules planned	See: www.peacemediation.ch/e-learning
New	Role plays	Role plays developed: UNRF II, Hamas-Israel, Ubangi, Kenya-Somalia cross border, Somalia informal economy	Available upon request (list of role plays in CSS-swisspeace MoU)

d) Outputs in 2010 (4th Contract Cycle)

#	Topic	Output	Written Reports?
11	Mediation Retraite for Diplomats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What next in Israel-Palestine Talks? Retreat for Swiss diplomats and ambassadors, 22-23 May 2010 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
12	Peace Mediation Course (PMC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2-week “Peace Mediation Course” (PMC), Oberhofen, 7-19 March 2010. See: www.peacemediation.ch 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
15	Development of MSP training website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of website to cover all its courses and create links to its e-learning modules and other learning materials 	See: www.peacemediation.ch
new	Coaching for mediators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training: Upon the request of the Mediation Support Unit (MSU) of UNDPA, MSP organized a mediation and negotiation training for 12 staff members of the Political Division of the UN Mission in Nepal (UNMIN) and 22 military observers from 22-28 February in Kathmandu. Coaching: The training team also offered the head of the UNMIN mission a special one-day coaching program, prepared after consultation to meet her specific requirements 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
new	Training for Mediators	MSP has also trained mediators who were not directly involved in an ongoing process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribution to EU Training for EUSRs in Brussels (27 and 28 October 2010) Israel Palestine Negotiation simulation, part of MA course University of Zurich, with Ambassador Thomas Greminger 	No reports (powerpoints and workshop contributions available upon request)

3. Networking

a) Outputs in 2005 and 2006 (1st Contract Cycle)

#	Topic	Achievements	Written Reports?
6	<i>Overview of existing networking capacities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Online Baseline Study up and running: www.swisspeace.org/mediation/whoiswho.asp 	See: http://www.swisspeace.org/mediation/whoiswho.html
7	<i>Workshop enhancing existing net-working capacities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st network meeting takes place with Dolores Gonzales from Mexico (joint venture MSP and KOFF); 25 participants 2nd network meeting takes place in March 2006 with Mateo Zuppi from Sant'Egidio; 40 participants 3rd network meeting takes place in June: 8 selected mediators (from EDA and from Swiss scene) meet to discuss synergies between the Swiss and the International mediation field 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
new	<i>swisspeace event: mediation and peacebuilding</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work plan written and shared with PD IV Event takes place in May in Aarau (50 people) Panel discussion on mediation with Didier Pfirter, Alain Sigg and Wolfgang Woernhard 	No report (round-table material available upon request)
new	<i>Participation in mediation forums and events</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSP takes part in various forums and events related to the mediation and facilitation topic These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Folke Bernadotte Seminar in Sweden (March) - HDC Mediator Retraite in Oslo (June) - HDC networking events 	No report (background material available upon request)
new	<i>ETH event: International Security Forum (ISF)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning of ISF International Security Forum; panel on “Promises and Pitfalls of Dialogue Between State and Armed, Non-State actors” (26 Oct 2006) 	No report (background material available upon request)

b) Outputs in 2007 (2nd Contract Cycle)

#	Activity	Output	Written Reports?
16	Mediation Roundtables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roundtable with Crisis Management Initiative (CMI) took place in Dec. 2006 (30 mediators from CH took part). Roundtable with HDC on “A guide to mediation” took place in Nov 2007 (about 30 people present). 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
17	International Security Forum (ISF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Panel on “Promises and Pitfalls of Dialogue Between State and Armed, Non-State actors” organised and lead by MSP (26 Oct 2006). Participation of two PDIV staff and Head of MSU (UNDPA) C. Coleman. 	No report (background material available upon request)
19	ISN mediation platform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internet-based information dossier for people interested in mediation and facilitation is up and running “Mediation and Facilitation in Peace Processes” §§ 	See footnote 6

c) Outputs in 2008 and 2009 (3rd Contract Cycle)

§§ <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Current-Affairs/ISN-Insights/Detail?lng=en&id=123028&contextid734=123028&contextid735=123891&tabid=123891>

#	Activity	Output	Written Reports?
18	Mediation Roundtables	1) MSP Roundtable 1: Insider Mediation with Nepalese Mediator Padma Ratna Tuladhar (July 2008) 2) MSP Roundtable 2: Charges against Sudanese President al-Bashir (September 2008) 3) MSP Roundtable 3: Kenya Election Crisis, Dekha Ibrahim Abdi, Spring 2009	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
19	Conferences	Various contributions from MSP side: 1) Federalism workshop organised by StateConcepts and DPIV 2) DPIV annual conference on mediation in Africa 3) Workshop in New York upon invitation to brief Jan Egeland on environment and conflict in the Sahel zone 4) UN and environment: One workshop and one conference upon invitation by the Belgium NGO "Justice et Paix" and the Belgium Foreign Ministry on environment and conflict prevention. Representatives of the four (China, USA, France, Britain) of the permanent members of the Security Council attended. 5) ISF panel on Somalia , with Andrea Semadeni, Julian Hottinger, Walid Abdelkarim http://www.8isf.ethz.ch/programme/Workshops/WS9.cfm 6) 2 day conference on EU mediation	No report (background material available upon request)
21	Developing a Mediation Support Network	MSP has overall coordination and secretariat function of the "Mediation Support Network" (10 mediation support organizations) meeting in 2008, Bern, 2009, London. Essential tool for coordination of mediation supporters	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
New	Religion and mediation	Organized and implemented a 2 day workshop in January 2009 on religion and transforming conflicts with Graduate Institute, MSP and DPIV	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
New	UN consultation	UN DPA MSU tasked MSP to consult with NGOs and write an input for the mediation report on the mediation activities of NGOs; MSP organized a 2 day workshop in Brussels and compiled the 15 p. input	See: Dropbox Shared Drive

d) Outputs in 2010 (4th Contract Cycle)

#	Topic	Output	Written Reports?
23	Mediation Roundtables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownbag Lunch on Guinea elections and mediation • Brownbag Lunch: framework for electoral mediator network (ELEMENT) 	No report (background material available upon request)
24	Coordinating "Mediation Support Network"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSP got the mandate from the group to act as the secretariat; • MSN meeting took place in Geneva on "Assessing mediation support", 24-25 Oct 2010 	See: http://www.mediationsupportnetwork.net/
26	Conferences/Workshops	Diverse workshop contributions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderating panel on conflicts and religion in DPIV 	No report (background material

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> annual conference "when religion and worldviews meet", 14 Oct 2010 Role play for SDM Impulstage, 7 May 2010 Negotiations in praxis, lecture at ETH Zurich, 18 May 2010 Half-day workshop on negotiating power and aggression, University of Zurich. 19 Feb 2010 Support and moderation of PDIV in JAPLA in Saanenöser, 27-28 Nov 2010 	available upon request)
--	--	---	-------------------------

4. Process Support

a) Outputs in 2005 and 2006 (1st Contract Cycle)

Working Area was not yet established during 1st contract cycle

b) Outputs in 2007 (2nd Contract Cycle)

#	Activity	Output	Written Reports?
14	Support for Peacebuilding Advisers (PBAs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intervision with Peacebuilding Advisor for Macedonia (Armin Rieser) took place Kosovo project proposal was evaluated by MSP Small intervension meeting with Burundi PBA (Marc George) took place. 	No report (background material available upon request)
15	Sporadic Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support to the planning of study of swisspeace's Humanitarian Dialogue in Chechnya. Co-organisation of a two-day workshop assessing a possible Chad mediation engagement (November 2007) 	No report (background material available upon request)

c) Outputs in 2008 and 2009 (3rd Contract Cycle)

#	Activity	Output	Written Reports?
15	Support for Peacebuilding Advisers (PBAs)	MSP focussed its support activities on the ' Special Peacebuilding Advisor for Darfur ' and obtained an additional mandate for this task from PDIV (November 2008 – June 2009).	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
16	Evaluation	MSP used the framework for evaluating / assessing mediation activities of the PDIV Special Envoy for Darfur.	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
17	Capacity building Workshops and logistical support	MSP supports PDIV in mediation activities in Switzerland. This support happened mainly through the separate mandate supporting the Darfur Special Envoy by providing logistics, role-plays for workshops (see activity line 15 above).	See: Dropbox Shared Drive

New	CAR	4 day Negotiation workshop in the “Central African Republic” (CAR) in February 2008 , together with the UN and PDIV. More information can be found in the separate workshop report.	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
New	Darfur	10 day workshop for Darfur SLM faction in Entebbe (July 2008), together with PDIV. More information can be found in the separate workshop report (ca. 80 pages)	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
New	Darfur	9 day Workshop in Löwenberg for Abdel Wahid group , MSP organized role play on one day (see activity line 15 above).	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
New	Darfur	Support for the Special PBA in Darfur (see activity line 15 above). 1) SLM U workshop in CH 2) Workshop for political parties in CH 3) Workshop for SLM field commanders in CH	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
New	Gaza	3 day workshop in Gaza with Hamas, Fatah and independents	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
New	Papua	4 day “dialogue facilitation” workshop for civil society in Papua, with EDA and hd in Singapore	See: Dropbox Shared Drive
New	North Korea	2 Day workshop “exchange of views” with members from Institute of Disarmament and Peace (IDP) from North Korea, with Sipri, CSS and Swiss embassy in Beijing	See: Dropbox Shared Drive

d) Outputs in 2010 (4th Contract Cycle)

#	Activity	Output	Written Reports?
19	Training, and capacity building of conflict parties, “Contact” with conflict parties	<p>MSP has supported several parties in ongoing mediation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guinea workshop on mediation and elections, 14-28 May 2010 (with Julian Hottinger and EISA) • Support of UN lead process for a rebel fraction by 2 MSP staff in spring 2010 in Doha 1 week • Workshop with North Koreans “Security issues related to the Korean Peninsula: Joint assessment of how to develop a peace regime”, 22-23 Nov 2010 Beijing, in close cooperation with PDIV, DPII, Swiss Embassy in Beijing (Pierre Hagmann) and SDC in Pyongyang • Confidential Kappel workshop on C-T dialogue process, 22-24 Sep 2010 in close cooperation with PDIV (Julian Hottinger, Murezi Michael) • Papua Workshop in Bali, requested by HDC and PBA in Jakarta in August 2010 (1 week training), in close cooperation with PDIV and one of their mediators (Julian Hottinger) 	See: Dropbox Shared Drive

Constructed Logical Framework Analysis

Strategic Intent	Mechanisms and Theories of Change	Desired Results and Indicia of Success
<p>The MD should catalyse and support a notable increase in Swiss contributions to mediation that transforms international conflicts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Influence Swiss and international policy-making in ways that support international mediation and Switzerland's role within it. Increase Swiss capabilities to conduct and support mediation. Depth of capabilities. Swiss actors should demonstrate state-of-the-art capabilities in mediation and mediation support. Breadth of capabilities. An increased number of Swiss actors should be capable to mediate and support mediation. Create entry points for Swiss assistance by building Swiss reputation and visibility. Externally. Switzerland should be increasingly perceived as, and called on, as a mediation resource. Internally. Swiss agents should increasingly identify mediation with Swiss values and interests. Contribute to a positive view of Swiss diplomacy, remaining congruent with Swiss values, identity, reputation and potential unique contributions. 	<p>The activities of the MD and its MSP – in concert with internal and external partners – enable Switzerland to reach its ambitious mediation goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation and Process Support provide expert capabilities that improve the analysis, planning, and intervention of Swiss and international actors. Lessons Learned / Topical Studies ensure that Swiss agents act on the basis of cumulative experience and best practice. Their publication also helps others. Training increases the depth and breadth of Swiss capabilities, and contributes to global mediation capacity. Networking and coordination with other mediation support actors increases the effectiveness and efficiency of Swiss and global efforts. Financial and technical support for other international, national and sub-national actors provides an additional avenue of indirect intervention. The MD / MSP Mechanism aggregates the perspectives, networks, reputations and capabilities of diverse organizations; extends reach and access through Swiss players; and provides reserve resources. Additionally, these activities cumulatively: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create a readiness and capacity to intervene; Build reputation in ways that create entry points for Swiss assistance. 	<p>Internal metrics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diplomats apply enhanced skill, sensitivity and will to find new entry points for Swiss mediation and mediation support. Swiss actors systematically apply best practices and lessons from Swiss experience. Strategic and operational linkages across Swiss actors build the coherence of Swiss policy and intervention. Enhanced support reflects sustainable structural capacity as well as current personal skill and relationships. <p>External metrics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> International actors increasingly engage Swiss assistance. Switzerland's enhanced expert capacity increasingly provides consultation and process support to mediation processes. The cumulative impact of Swiss efforts increases. There is evident empowerment of other actors. MD / MSP contributions make a meaningful difference to the quality and impact of Swiss intervention. Swiss reputation and visibility increase. <p>MSP Metrics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MSP efficiently produces quality work products. MSP products are unique, additive contributions. Transaction / coordination / management costs are low. Resource allocation is flexible, responsive to need and appropriate to role. <p>Institutional memory, quality assurance and continuity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> improve.
		<p>Key Forward-Looking Hypotheses to Develop and Test</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An optimized MD requires a PDIW-wide mediation strategy that itself takes into account the broader range of Swiss actors A shift in focus from "activity lines" to "capabilities" or "assets" will enable improved strategic focus for prioritization of resources Recognition and definition of the distinct "thematic," "expert," and "programme" roles of the MD will lend clarity to strategic and operational planning More sharply focused efforts (by geography, theme, characteristics of the conflict, role of actor, partner, etc.) will create a more "virtuous cycle" of intervention

LIST OF PERSONS CONSULTED

As of 15 July 2011

Within PD IV

Andrea Aeby
Natacha Antille
Sarah Bernasconi
Mo Bleeker
Monika Egger
Marc Georges
Corinne Henchoz
Julian T. Hottinger
Claudia Huitado
Markus Leitner
Murezi Michael
Roland Salvisberg
Frank Schuerch
Kim Sitzler
Martin Stürzinger
Caroline Tissot
Claude Wild

Within SDC

Segolene Adam
Markus Heiniger
Kuno Schläfli
Kathi Zellweger

Within MSP Constituent Organizations

Elisabeth Baumgartner, swisspeace
Laurent Goetschel, swisspeace
Sara Hellmüller, swisspeace
David Lanz, swisspeace
Anita Müller, swisspeace
Matthias Siegfried, swisspeace
Simon Mason, CSS / ETHZ
Victor Mauer, CSS / ETHZ
Damiano Sguaitamatti, CSS / ETHZ
Andreas Wenger, CSS / ETHZ

Other FDFA

Didier Chassot
Michele Coduri
Michael Cottier
Thomas Greminger
Pierre Hagmann
Georg Stein

Outside Organizations

Norbert Roppers, Berghof Foundation
Oliver Wils, Berghof Foundation
Katia Papagianni, CHD
Marc Probst, CHD, Singapore
Michael Vatikiotis, CHD
Andy Carl, Conciliation Resources
Jonathan Cohen, Conciliation Resources
Kai Sauer, Embassy of Finland in Indonesia
Tebay Neles, Fajar Timur School of Theology,
informal leader of Papua group
Legawork Assefa, previously at IGAD
Muridan Widjojo, Indonesian Institute of Sciences,
LIPI
Prof. Dr. Lars Kirchhoff, Institut für
Konfliktmanagement
Scott Weber, Interpeace
Antje Herrberg, MediatEUR
Rachel Gasser, UN/DPA/MSU
Sebastien Lapierre, UN/DPA/MSU
Denise O'Brien, UN/DPA/MSU
Nicole Toepperwien, X-impulse

EVALUATOR BIOGRAPHIES

STHLM Policy Group (www.STHLMGroup.se)

Sthlm Policy Group offers public and private organizations advice on issues relating to international peace and security in an international development cooperation context. It focuses on strategic analysis and advice in ongoing policy and planning processes and programme design. It conducts evaluations of organizations and programmes to incorporate analysis into results-based management processes.

Brian Ganson, Evaluation Team Leader (Brian.Ganson@USB.ac.za)

Brian Ganson is Senior Researcher with the Africa Centre for Dispute Settlement at the University of Stellenbosch. He is also Senior Fellow with the Center for Emerging Market Enterprises of the Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy at Tufts University. He has lectured on international negotiation and law & development at both institutions. His work focuses on complex collaboration, organizational strategy, and negotiation, particularly in multi-national, cross-organizational, and developing country environments. He has led or co-led a variety of evaluation and monitoring projects in post-conflict and volatile societies. He was formerly with Conflict Management Group, founded to apply the innovative approaches of the Harvard Negotiation Project to intense or protracted conflicts of public importance.

Nicklas Svensson, Evaluator (Nicklas@STHLMGroup.se)

Nicklas Svensson is Partner of Sthlm Policy Group in Sweden. Nicklas holds a Master of Arts in Law and Diplomacy at The Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy at Tufts University, and a Master in Political Science at Lund University. He has also studied at HEC MBA programme at the HEC School of Management, and Middle Eastern studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in Israel. Nicklas advises leading NGOs, agencies and companies in policy development and strategy in complex and fragile situations. He focuses on human security and development. He has carried out more than 20 assignments in different parts of the world. Nicklas leads Sthlm Policy Group's project on businesses and development in fragile situations.

Laurie Nathan, Senior Advisor (Laurie.Nathan@UP.ac.za)

Dr. Laurie Nathan is Director of the Centre for Mediation at Pretoria University and Visiting Professor at Cranfield University. He co-ordinates the Centre's program on regional and international axes of conflict. Between 1992 and 2003 he headed the UCT Centre for Conflict Resolution. He has been a member of the Advisory Committee of the Arms Division of Human Rights Watch, the Carter Center's International Council for Conflict Resolution, the Expert Advisory Group of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Democratic Governance Practice Network, and the African Union's mediation team for Darfur. He has written extensively on the Darfur mediation, and drafted South Africa's White Paper on Defense in 1996 and the South African Development Community (SADC) Protocol on Politics, Defense and Security Cooperation in 2001.